

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Victor Tagle, Sr.,

Plaintiff

V.

Core Civic America, et al.,

## Defendants

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00544-JAD-NJK

## Order Dismissing Action

[ECF Nos. 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 22]

Pro se plaintiff Victor Tagle, Sr., brings this “tort action” for events that allegedly occurred during his incarceration with the Nevada Department of Corrections.<sup>1</sup> On June 1, 2018, he filed his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* because he has three strikes under § 1915(g) and failed to demonstrate that he was under imminent danger of serious physical injury.<sup>2</sup> I gave him until June 30, 2018, to pay the full \$400 filing fee.<sup>3</sup> I expressly told him that his case would be dismissed if he failed to pay the filing fee by that deadline.<sup>4</sup> The deadline has passed, and Tagle has not paid the filing fee.<sup>5</sup> Though he filed an “Answer to Plaintiff’s Order,”<sup>6</sup> it fails to demonstrate an imminent danger of serious physical injury.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.<sup>7</sup> A court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action,

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 1-1 (tort action).

2 ECF No. 16.

3 *Id.*

4 *Id*

<sup>5</sup> Tagle has also filed a slew of other motions. (ECF Nos. 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 22). None of these motions demonstrates that Tagle is in imminent danger of serious physical injury. I deny these motions as moot.

6 ECF No. 20

<sup>7</sup> *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

1 failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.<sup>8</sup> In determining whether to  
2 dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with  
3 local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious  
4 resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the  
5 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the  
6 availability of less drastic alternatives.<sup>9</sup>

7 I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the  
8 litigation and the court's interest in managing its docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case.  
9 The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury  
10 arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or  
11 prosecuting an action.<sup>10</sup> The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
12 dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in  
13 dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.<sup>11</sup> Tagle was warned that his  
14 case would be dismissed if he failed to pay the \$400 filing fee in full by June 30, 2018.<sup>12</sup> So,  
15 Tagle had adequate warning that his failure to pay the fee would result in this case's dismissal.

### 16 Conclusion

17 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** without  
18 prejudice based on Tagle's failure to pay the full filing fee in compliance with this court's June  
19 1, 2018, order.

20 <sup>8</sup> See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with  
21 local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to  
22 comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–  
23 41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to  
keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.  
1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,  
1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

24 <sup>9</sup> *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;  
25 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

26 <sup>10</sup> See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

27 <sup>11</sup> *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

28 <sup>12</sup> ECF No. 16.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all pending motions [ECF Nos. 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17,  
2 **19, and 22**] are DENIED as moot.

3 The **Clerk of Court** is directed to **ENTER JUDGMENT** accordingly and **CLOSE**  
4 **THIS CASE.**

5 Dated: July 9, 2018

6   
7 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28